# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	<u>-</u>
O.A., et al.,	) )
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	Civil Action No. 3:18-cv-02718-RDM
Donald J. Trump, et al.,	)
Defendants.	) ) )

# **STATUS REPORT**

Pursuant to order of the Court issued January 28, 2019 "that the parties shall meet and confer and submit a joint status report, on or before Friday, February 1, 2019, that includes a proposed briefing schedule taking into account the duration of the lapse in appropriations," the parties submit this status report.

#### 1. Other cases

On January 31, 2019, the government moved the Ninth Circuit to consolidate *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Donald Trump*, No. 18-17274 (9th Cir.), and *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Donald Trump*, No. 18-17436 (9th Cir.), and to take both cases out of abeyance and issue a briefing schedule. *See* Ex. 1. The parties in *East Bay* proposed that the government's opening brief be due 28 days from the date the Ninth Circuit issues an order, that plaintiffs' response brief be due 28 days thereafter, and that the government's reply brief be due 21 days after that. The Ninth Circuit has not yet issued a scheduling order and the preliminary injunction issued by the district court, *see East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, No. 18-CV-06810-JST, 2018 WL 6660080 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2018), remains in force.

### 2. Scheduling

The parties have met and conferred but do not agree on a schedule for further briefing in this case.

# a. Plaintiffs' position

Plaintiffs propose the following schedule:

- Defendants serve a certified administrative record with correct caption on Plaintiffs within 7 days of the date the Court issues its order.
- Defendants' cross-motion and opposition due 14 days from the date the Court issues its order.
- Plaintiffs' opposition and reply due 14 days thereafter.
- Defendants' reply due 7 days thereafter.

This schedule appropriately restores the briefing schedule in effect before the lapse in appropriations, and it affords Defendants the same amount of time to draft their opening summary-judgment brief as Plaintiff's received in drafting their opening brief's (indeed, it affords more time, because the Court's stay was entered three days after Defendants' original 14-day briefing period began). Furthermore, this schedule complies with this Court's order to propose "a briefing schedule taking into account the duration of the lapse in appropriations." The lapse in appropriations has already substantially delayed the progress of this case, and affording Defendants more than 14 days to draft its brief would risk further delays if appropriations once again lapse on February 15. Given that the case was almost fully briefed on the merits at the preliminary-injunction stage, and that the Court has permitted the parties to incorporate by reference their summary judgment papers, Defendants' proposal that the Court extend the briefing

schedule substantially beyond the period contemplated by the Court's prior briefing order is both unnecessary and unwarranted.

#### b. Defendants' position

Defendants propose the following schedule:

- Defendants serve a certified administrative record with correct caption on Plaintiffs within 14 days of the date the Court issues its order.
- Defendants' cross-motion and opposition due 28 days from the date the Court issues its order.
- Plaintiffs' opposition and reply due 28 days thereafter.
- Defendants' reply due 14 days thereafter.

Defendants believe this schedule is appropriate because the *East Bay* injunction remains in place and there is no realistic possibility that it will be reversed or revised by the Ninth Circuit or the Supreme Court before the completion of briefing under Defendants' schedule. Plaintiffs and their putative class thus cannot claim any exigency that would warrant a more expedited schedule. Defendants also note that, consistent with the January 7, 2019 proceedings before this Court, counsel for Defendants have not worked on their response briefs in this case (and have, even since the lapse in appropriations ended, continued to await further order of this Court before working on those briefs). *See* ECF No. 61.

//

//

//

//

//

Dated: February 1, 2019 Respectfully submitted,

/s/Thomas G. Hentoff

Thomas G. Hentoff (D.C. Bar No. 438394)

Ana C. Reyes (D.C. Bar No. 477354)

Ellen E. Oberwetter (D.C. Bar No. 480431)

Mary Beth Hickcox-Howard (D.C. Bar No. 1001313)

Charles L. McCloud<sup>1</sup> Matthew D. Heins\*

Vanessa O. Omoroghomwan\*

WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP

725 Twelfth Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

Tel: (202) 434-5000 Fax: (202) 434-5029

Hardy Vieux (D.C. Bar No. 474762)

**HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST** 

805 15th Street, N.W., Suite 900

Washington, D.C. 20005

Tel: (202) 547-5692

Fax: (202) 553-5999

Eleni Rebecca Bakst\*

Anwen Hughes\*

**HUMAN RIGHTS FIRST** 

75 Broad Street, 31st Floor

New York, New York 10004

Tel: (212) 845-5200

Fax: (212) 845-5299

Charles George Roth\*

Keren Hart Zwick (D.D.C. Bar No. IL0055)

Gianna Borroto\*

Ruben Loyo\*

NATIONAL IMMIGRANT JUSTICE CENTER

208 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 1300

Chicago, Illinois 60604

Tel: (312) 660-1370

Fax: (312) 660-1505

Attorneys for O.A. Plaintiffs

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pursuant to LCvR 83.2(g).

Manoj Govindaiah RAICES, Inc. 1305 N. Flores Street San Antonio, TX 78212 Telephone: (210) 222-0964 Facsimile: (210) 212-4856

manoj.govindaiah@raicestexas.org

Counsel for Plaintiff Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services, Inc.

#### /s/ Justin W. Bernick

Neal K. Katyal (Bar No. 462071) T. Clark Weymouth (Bar No. 391833) Craig A. Hoover (Bar No. 386918) Justin W. Bernick (Bar No. 988245) Zachary W. H. Best (Bar No. 1003717) Mitchell P. Reich\* (Bar No. 1044671) Elizabeth Hagerty (Bar No. 1022774) Kaitlin Welborn (Bar No. 88187724) 555 Thirteenth Street NW Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: (202) 637-5600 Facsimile: (202) 637-5910 neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com  $t.wey \\ mouth \\ @hog an lovells.com$ craig.hoover@hoganlovells.com justin.bernick@hoganlovells.com zachary.best@hoganlovells.com mitchell.reich@hoganlovells.com elizabeth.hagerty@hoganlovells.com kaitlin.welborn@hoganlovells.com

Thomas P. Schmidt\*
875 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 918-5547
Facsimile: (212) 918-3000
thomas.schmidt@hoganlovells.com

\* Admitted pro hac vice

Counsel for S.M.S.R. Plaintiffs

By: /s/ Erez Reuveni
EREZ REUVENI
Assistant Director
Office of Immigration Litigation
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division
P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, DC 20044
Tel: (202) 307-4293
Email: Erez.R.Reuveni@usdoj.gov

For Defendants

<sup>\*\*</sup> Pro hac vice forthcoming

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 

I hereby certify that on February 1, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing document

with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of for the District of Columbia by using the

CM/ECF system. Counsel in the case are registered CM/ECF users and service will be

accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

By: /s/ Erez Reuveni

EREZ REUVENI

**Assistant Director** 

United States Department of Justice

Civil Division

6